

**United States Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management**

**Categorical Exclusion Not Established By Statute
DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0111-CX**

April 2015

Graffiti Removal Efforts at Moonshine Arch

Location: Township 3 South, Range 21 East, Section 15 and Section 20, SLB Meridian, Uintah County, Utah.

Vernal Field Office
170 South 500 East
Vernal, Utah 84078
435-781-4400



CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION REVIEW AND APPROVAL

Project Name: Graffiti Removal Efforts as Moonshine Arch

Chapter 1. Categorical Exclusion

A. Background

BLM Office: Vernal Field Office

Location of Proposed Action: The project area is approximately 8 miles north of Vernal, Utah in Section 15, T3S, 21E; Uintah County.

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0111-CX

Lead Preparer: Bill Civish, Vernal Field Office

Project or Serial Number:

Description of Proposed Action: Graffiti Removal Efforts as Moonshine Arch

The purpose of the proposed project is to facilitate the removal of the high level of graffiti that extends throughout the alcove of the arch. Located on BLM public lands, Moonshine Arch is a large sandstone escarpment about 85 ft in length and extends up to 40 ft above. The graffiti begins on top of the sandstone bedrock exposures near the parking area and continues along the trail, all the way to Moonshine Arch, where the most extensive damage is centered. In total, there are 13 different main concentrations of graffiti panels comprising several hundred elements.

Field Methods: Varieties of treatments are available from which to choose the most appropriate method of graffiti removal that will not damage the surface. In order to determine the *gentlest means possible*, several cleaning methods or materials will be tested prior to selecting the best one to use. Before selecting a removal method, all cleaning materials and techniques for removing graffiti will be tested on mock-ups or areas of the resource that are not highly visible, but which are representative of typical conditions. Visual observation should be supplemented by the use of a magnifying glass, and spot tests should be carried out to help identify what methods and tools will aid in its removal. Testing will begin with the gentlest and least invasive method proceeding gradually, if necessary, to more complicated methods, or a combination of methods.

Project Location: Township 3 South, Range 21 East, Section 15 and Section 20, SLB Meridian, Uintah County, Utah. See Attached Map.

B. Vernal Field Office Resource Management Plan

Land Use Plan Name: Vernal Field Office Resource Management Plan

Date Approved/Amended: ROD approved in 2008

The proposed action is consistent with the decisions of the Vernal Field Office Resource Management Plan Record of Decision (ROD 2008). The ROD aims to allow the continued available use of outdoor recreation opportunities and experiences including protecting natural resources and enhancing recreation opportunities. It also allows for maintenance of all recreational sites (pages 106-107). The project would not conflict with other decisions throughout the plan.

C. Compliance with NEPA

The Departmental Manual (516 DM 2.3A(3) and 516 DM 2, Appendix 2) requires that before any action described in the following list of CXs is used, the list of "extraordinary circumstances" must be reviewed for applicability. If a CX does not pass the "extraordinary circumstances" test, the proposed action analysis defaults to either an EA or an EIS. When no "extraordinary circumstances" apply, the following activities do not require the preparation of an EA or EIS. In addition, see 516 DM 2, Appendix 1 for a list of DOI-wide categorical exclusions. As proposed actions are designed and then reviewed against the CX list, proposed actions or activities must be, at a minimum, consistent with the DOI and the BLM regulations, manuals, handbooks, policies, and applicable land use plans regarding design features, best management practices, terms and conditions, conditions of approval, and stipulations.

The action described above generally does not require the preparation of an environmental assessment (EA) or environmental impact statement (EIS), as it has been found to not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. The applicable Categorical Exclusion reference is in 516 DM 11.9 J (10). This reference states, "Removal of structures and materials of no historical value, such as abandoned automobiles, fences, and buildings, including those built in trespass and reclamation of the site when little or no surface disturbance is involved."

Appendix A. Extraordinary Circumstances Documentation

Categorical Exclusion Rationale

CX Number	DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0111-CX
Date	04/20/2015
Lease/Case File/Serial Number	
Regulatory Authority (CFR or Law)	43 CFR 8365.1-5 (a)(2)

Section 1.1 Impacts on Public Health and Safety

1. Does the proposed action have significant impacts on public health and safety?		
Yes	No	REVIEWER/TITLE
	X	Bill Civish, Outdoor Rec Planner

Rationale: Public health and safety would not be affected by this action. The BLM will abide by all safety procedures for proper use of their equipment as required by law.

Section 1.2 Impacts on Natural Resources or Unique Geographic Characteristics

2. Does the proposed action have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness or wilderness study areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; migratory birds (Executive Order 13186); and other ecologically significant or critical areas?		
Yes	No	REVIEWER/TITLE
	X	Bill Civish, Outdoor Rec Planner

Rationale: The proposal falls within the Red Mountain-Dry Fork ACEC. Cultural resources and high quality scenery would not be impacted by the proposed project because no permanent facilities would be installed and all disturbed areas would be reclaimed. The area has been identified as being natural with opportunities for solitude and recreation. The only impact to these qualities would be at the time of graffiti removal. The graffiti removal would not be noticeable after completion. The project would be in conformance with the VRM Class objectives. After consulting with the specialists in the Vernal Field Office and reviewing the VFORMP and the GIS data layers that are available, it has been determined that there are no impacts that would be significant by authorizing the proposed action.

Section 1.3 Level of Controversy

3. Does the proposed action have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA Section 102(2)(E)]?		
Yes	No	REVIEWER/TITLE
	X	Bill Civish, Outdoor Rec Planner

Rationale: The project is within an existing multi use recreational corridor. There are no known controversial environmental effects or conflicts of use within the project area.

Section 1.4 Highly Uncertain or Unique or Unknown Environmental Risks

4. Does the proposed action have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?		
Yes	No	REVIEWER/TITLE
	X	Bill Civish, Outdoor Rec Planner

Rationale: No additional disturbance for this project, and does not have uncertain, potentially significant, or unique environmental effects.

Section 1.5 Precedent Setting

5. Does the proposed action establish a precedent for future action, or represent a decision in principle about future actions, with potentially significant environmental effects?		
Yes	No	REVIEWER/TITLE
	X	Bill Civish, Outdoor Rec Planner

Rationale: The proposed action is not connected to another action that would require further environmental analysis and would not set a precedent for future actions that would normally require environmental analysis.

Section 1.6 Cumulatively Significant Effects

6. Does the proposed action have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects?		
Yes	No	REVIEWER/TITLE
	X	Bill Civish, Outdoor Rec Planner

Rationale: The proposed project is not expected to have a direct relationship to other actions that will cumulatively have a significant environmental effect. Other actions in the project area that are directly related to the proposed action also have insignificant environmental impacts, and the combined impact of these projects and the proposed action is not expected to be significant.

Section 1.7 Impacts on Cultural Properties

7. Does the proposed action have significant impacts on properties listed or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places as determined by either the Bureau or office?		
Yes	No	REVIEWER/TITLE
	X	Leticia Neal, Archaeologist

Rationale: A reconnaissance level cultural resource survey was conducted on March 31, 2015 (Neal 2015; U-15-BL-0252b). No cultural resources are identified within the area of potential effects; historic properties were avoided by project design and implementation. Consultation with Utah State Historic Preservation Office was completed by April, 2015.

Section 1.8 Impacts on Federally Listed Species or Critical Habitat

8. Does the proposed action have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species?		
Yes	No	REVIEWER/TITLE
	X	Dixie Sadlier, Wildlife Biologist
	X	Jessi Bronson, Botanist

Rationale:

Wildlife: No formal Section 7 consultation/concurrence with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service was required or requested. No water sources will be used. Threatened and Endangered Species review has occurred through the onsite as well as BLM GIS data. No coordination with the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources was required or requested.

Plants: The Project Area is not located within potential habitat or designated Critical Habitat for any listed endangered or threatened plant species, and there is low potential for these species to occur in the Project Area. In addition, the project is located entirely on existing disturbance, and should not have significant impacts on any endangered or threatened plant species.

Section 1.9 Compliance with Laws

9. Does the proposed action violate a Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?		
Yes	No	REVIEWER/TITLE
	X	Bill Civish, Outdoor Rec Planner

Rationale: The proposed action would not violate any county or state statutes. Formal Section 7 consultation with USFWS for Threatened and Endangered species was not required or requested for this project; No water sources will be used for the graffiti removal: the proposed project would not violate the Endangered Species Act. Onsite observations, BLM GIS, and air quality studies/modeling data have shown that the proposed project will not violate the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, or Migratory Bird Act.

Section 1.10 Environmental Justice

10. Does the proposed action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898)?		
Yes	No	REVIEWER/TITLE
	X	Bill Civish, Outdoor Rec Planner

Rationale: Low income or minority populations are not present in the project area. Low income or minority populations would not receive disproportionately high or adverse human health or environmental effects from the proposed action. Health and environmental statutes would not be compromised by the proposed action.

Section 1.11 Indian Sacred Sites

11. Does the proposed action limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious practitioners, or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007)?		
Yes	No	REVIEWER/TITLE
	X	Leticia Neal, Archaeologist

Rationale: The proposed project would not limit access or ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sites.

Section 1.12 Noxious and Non-Native Invasive Species

12. Does the proposed action contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area, or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112)?		
Yes	No	REVIEWER/TITLE
	X	Bill Civish, Outdoor Rec Planner

Rationale: No additional disturbance for this project.

Categorical Exclusion

Preparer Information



Bill Civish,
Outdoor Rec Planner



Stephanie J. Howard,
Acting Assistant Field Manager